



*The Public Service Commission
State of South Carolina*

Jocelyn Boyd
Chief Clerk/Administrator
Phone: (803) 896-5133
Fax: (803) 896-5246

✓ MAILED 284047
COMMISSIONERS
Comer H. "Randy" Randall, Third District
Chairman
Justin T. Williams, Sixth District
Vice Chairman
John E. "Butch" Howard, First District
Florence P. Belser, Second District
Thomas J. "Tom" Ervin, Fourth District
Swain E. Whitfield, Fifth District
G. O'Neal Hamilton, Seventh District

Administrative Department
Phone: (803) 896-5100
Fax: (803) 896-5246

April 8, 2019

Dear Ms. Karen J. Hastings,

This is to acknowledge receipt of your Letter of Protest/Comments to the Public Service Commission of South Carolina. Your Letter of Protest/Comments will be placed in the Protest File of the Docket listed below and on the Commission's Website at www.psc.sc.gov.

- Docket No. 2018-318-E - Application of Duke Energy Progress, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for an Accounting Order

A Protestant is an individual objecting on the ground of private or public interest to the approval of an Application, Petition, Motion or other matters which the Commission may have under consideration. A Protestant may offer sworn testimony but cannot cross-examine witnesses offered by other parties.

According to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, filing a Protest does not make you a Party of Record. A Protestant desiring to become an Intervenor (i.e., a Party of Record) in a proceeding before the Commission may file a Petition for Intervention within the time prescribed by the Commission.

You can follow this Docket and other daily filings made at the Commission by subscribing to the Commission's Email Subscriptions at this link: <https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Email>; or you can follow the individual Docket at the link listed below:

Docket No. 2018-318-E - Application of Duke Energy Progress, LLC for Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for an Accounting Order - <https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Dockets/Detail/116871>

If we may be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Becky Latimer
Clerks Office/Administrative Coordinator
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
803-896-5100

Sign up for Meeting Agenda Alerts: Text [PSCAGENDAS](https://dms.psc.sc.gov/Web/Dockets/Detail/116871) to 39492

April 3, 2019

Public Service Commission of S.C.
101 Executive Center Dr. Suite 100
Columbia, South Carolina 29210

Dear Sirs and Madam:

I wish to protest the proposed base facilities charges and other changes as proposed by Duke Energy in Docket No. 2018-318-E.

As a military retiree, I have spent over two decades in federal service both as active duty and as contractor in civil engineering. I've been through about a dozen typhoons/hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, and other natural disasters. I have identified and assessed structure and utility damage as well as estimated and tracked engineer repair efforts to Department of Defense installations. As such, I am more familiar than most with the amount of money, effort and time it takes for an area and a utility service to recover from such an event. Duke Energy did an excellent and timely job after hurricanes Florence and Michael in restoring services, and I recognize this incurred them a not inconsiderable amount of cost.

I also recognize these costs will only increase with the effects of global warming producing more extreme weather patterns, to include later and stronger hurricanes. However, scientists have been sounding the warning regarding this effect since the 1990s, and efforts to prepare federal installations for the effects of such events have been going on for 10-15 years at key locations. If Duke Energy had spent a fraction of its average yearly profit on such efforts, the damage and downtime would have been mitigated. Additionally, they seemingly failed to plan for the financial effects of such events. Passing this failure to properly plan along to the rate payers in South Carolina is unacceptable, especially given the large compensation packages the CEO and executives enjoy. Actions and failure to act prudently and plan ahead should have consequences for them as a company and as executives, the same as everyone else. I've no desire to put them out of business, but companies are not always guaranteed a profit every single year, regardless of if they are utilities or not.

Regarding the proposed increase to pay for coal ash removal in North Carolina, why should the rate payers in South Carolina pay for a measure we have no control over, legislatively or legally?

The initial requested base charge increase of \$20 a month, along with their quick agreement to accept a reduced increase of \$2.85 a month for residential customers, indicates either they didn't crunch the numbers right the first time, this is a cash grab, or this is a negotiating tactic for this and future increase proposals. Regardless, their profit and CEO/executive compensation shows they're not hurting for money as badly as their proposal might otherwise imply.

Additionally, I would like to note that I do not recall ever receiving a notice from Duke Energy about the proposed increases. Duke requires its customers who utilize direct debit to pay bills automatically to sign up for electronic billing. In order to see anything other than my balance due, such as a bill insert, I need to log in to the system and look for it. Considering the company otherwise utilizes email quite effectively to communicate storm status, track energy usage, offer products and services, and generally inform consumers, I find this lack of notice to be disturbing.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Karen J. Hastings", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Karen J. Hastings

Sumter, SC 29150